

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**B. LEWIS, CH. PELLAT AND J. SCHACHT**

ASSISTED BY J. BURTON-PAGE, C. DUMONT AND V. L. MÉNAGE AS  
EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME II

C—G

FOURTH IMPRESSION



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1991

kl, *Rahmat al-umma fi ikhtilāf al-a'imma*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥamid, Cairo, 255 ff.; Ibn al-Humān, *Fath al-ḥadīr*, Cairo, viii, 244 ff.; Ibn Qudāma, *Mughnī*, 3rd. ed. Rashīd Riḍā, Cairo 1367/1947, vii, 636 ff., viii, 1 ff.; *Khirshī*, Commentary on the *Mukhtaṣar* of *Khallīl*, viii, 2 ff.; Querry, *Recueil de lois concernant les musulmans chiītes*, Paris 1871, ii, 541 ff.; *Shāfi'ī*, *Kitāb al-Umm*, Cairo 1903, vi, 2 ff.; Abou-Heif, *La diya* (Arabic translation from the French), Cairo 1932; Hakim, *Le dommage de source délictuelle et son évaluation en droit musulman*, thesis (typewritten), Beirut 1955, 1 ff.; Juynboll, *Handbuch*, 295 ff., 353; Tyan, *Système de responsabilité délictuelle en droit musulman*, thesis, Lyon 1926, 13 ff. (E. TYAN)

**DIYĀ GÖKALP** [see GÖKALP, ZIYA].

**DIYĀ PAŞHA** [see ZIYA].

**DIYĀFA** [see DAYF, MIHMĀN, MUSĀFIR].

**DIYĀLĀ**, an important river of east-central 'Irāk. Its name, of unknown origin and meaning, is ancient, appearing in antiquity as Σύλλα or Δέλας or Dialas; its upper waters are known as the Sirwān or (originally and more correctly) *Shirwān*, as known to Yāqūt, and this name is in common use for most of its length. It forms a left-bank tributary of the *Diḡla* (Tigris), navigable only by small craft, and with a discharge formidable in the flood season (March-May), slight in the later summer and autumn.

The river rises in western Persia, where the many hill-streams (often dry in the summer and autumn) which unite to form its principal tributaries drain (1) the area north of Kirmānshāh, (2) the area both north and south of Sanādāḡ (Senna, Sihna) in the Ardalan province, (3) the Perso-'Irāḡī frontier area around Mariwān, (4) the westerly area of Kirmānshāh province, west of Karind, opposite ('Irāḡī) *Khānīḡin* and (Persian) *Qaşr-i Shirīn*. The first three of these sources have made their contributions before the main stream of the Sirwān crosses the frontier; the tributaries are known locally by various names, all flowing in valleys of great natural beauty and inhabited, from time immemorial, by Persian-Kurdish tribesmen. The contribution from area (4) of those suggested above forms the Alwānd river (the *Hulwān* river of 'Abbāsīd times, called from the famous town of that name) and enters immediately west of *Khānīḡin*, in 'Irāk. The Tandjiera stream, draining the *Shahrizūr* valley (*Sulaymāniyya liwā'*), also forms an 'Irāḡī contribution; there are others of lesser importance. The middle course of the river, until realignment by the Frontier Commission of 1333/1914, marked the Turko-Persian boundary in so far as that had by then been stabilized; but areas west of this sector, now forming part of *Khānīḡin ḡadā*, were then assigned to Turkey as "Transferred Territories".

The river greatly changes its character in its middle and lower course, where it flows first through undulating, then through flat country, diminishing its speed of flow, and lending itself to important use for irrigation. Near the point where it breaks through the *Djabal Ḥamrīn* a series of major canals takes off, and maintains extensive date gardens and winter and summer crops. These are notably, from the right bank, the *Khālīṣ* canal, which waters *Daltāwa* [q.v.], and from the left bank the *Rūz* (on which stands *Balad Rūz*), the *Mahrūt*, and the *Khurāsān*. The intensive cultivation and famous ruins of the *Diylā liwā'*—itself named from the river, of which it contains nearly the whole length in 'Irāk (*liwā'*) headquarters at *Ba'ḡūba*, dependent

ḡadās of *Khānīḡin*, *Mandalī*, *Khālīṣ*, and *Ba'ḡūba*—are due entirely to the presence of these canals, and to water-lift irrigation by *Karad* and mechanical pump from the main stream. This irrigation system is similar to, but less than and not identical to, that prevailing in the 3rd/9th to 7th/13th centuries, before its ruin by the Mongols; but in that age, or most of it, the *Diylā* waters below the *Djabal Ḥamrīn* discharged into the great *Tāmarā-Nahrawān* canal (see *DIḡLA*, and *NAHRAWĀN*), and were extensively canalized from it; a major part was probably delivered to the *Tigris* at or near the present mouth, 10 miles below *Baghdād*. Technically, the relation between the *Diylā* (with its capacity for sudden and formidable flooding) and the *Nahrawān* canal-system, remains obscure; nomenclature varies in the Arab geographers, who do not distinguish between canals and mere flood-channels, and at times even identify the *Diylā* with the *Nahrawān* or *Tāmarā*. The mediaeval cities dependent on the *Diylā* and its connected canals included *Nahrawān*, *Bāḡjisrā*, *Ba'ḡūba*, *Daskara* and *Ḍjalūlā*. The area astride its lower course was closely administered and sustained hundreds of villages and a dense population; traces of *Sāsānīan* and older sites indicate that this had always been a favoured region. The main road from *Baghdād* to, and through, the province of *al-Djibāl*—the *Khurāsān* highway—ran through it, and largely followed the course of the river; this is still the case; the motor-road running from *Baghdād* to and across the Persian frontier follows substantially the old alignment by way of *Ba'ḡūba*, *Shahrabān*, *Ḳizil Rubāt*, *Khānīḡin*, and *Qaşr-i Shirīn*. The metre-gauge railway to *Khānīḡin*, constructed in and after 1337/1918, follows a similar line; railway bridges exist at *Ba'ḡūba* and at *Qaraghān*, where the *Kirkūk-Irbil* line branches off.

*Bibliography*: For the Arab geographers, see bibliography under *DIḡLA*; equally for the relevant works of Streck, Le Strange, Willcocks, and Longrigg. (S. H. LONGRIGG)

**DIYĀR BAKR**, properly "abode of (the tribe of) Bakr", the designation of the northern province of the *Djazīra*. It covers the region on the left and right banks of the *Tigris* from its source to the region where it changes from its west-east course to flow in a south-easterly direction. It is, therefore, the upper basin of the *Tigris*, from the region of *Sīfirt* and *Tell Fāfān* to that of *Arḡanīn* to the north-west of *Āmid* and *Ḥiṣn al-Hamma* (*Ġermūk*) to the west of *Āmid*. Yāqūt points out that *Diylā Bakr* does not extend beyond the plain.

*Diylā Bakr* is so called because it became, during the 1st/7th century, the habitat of an important portion of the *Rabī'a* tribe of *Bakr* b. *Wā'il* [q.v.]. The latter had already moved forward, following the tribal wars of the pre-Islamic period, into Mesopotamia. Having stayed for some time in the region of *al-Kūfa*, the *Bakrī* groups spread out towards the north. It was at the time of the conquests under the caliphate of 'Uṡmān, while *Mu'āwiya* was governor of Syria and the *Djazīra*, that some *Muḡarī* and *Rabī'ī* tribes were settled in the unoccupied lands of this region on the orders of the government. *Mu'āwiya* installed these *Muḡarīs* in what came to be called the *Diylā Muḡar* and the *Rabī'īs* in what came to be called the *Diylā Rabī'a*. *Al-Balāḡhūrī*, who gives us this information, does not mention the *Bakrīs* expressly, who were included in the *Rabī'ī* group, but it is probable that it was in the same manner and at the same time

that they established themselves in the Diyār Bakr. This appellation does not however mean that this territory was inhabited by Bakrīs alone; on the other hand, there were Bakrīs elsewhere.

The Diyār Bakr and the Diyār Rabīʿa, since the two groups were connected, are sometimes spoken of jointly under the single name of Diyār Rabīʿa (Yāqūt, ii, 637).

The principal towns of the Diyār Bakr are Āmid, the capital, Mayyāfāriqīn, Ḥiṣn Kayfā, and Arzan, which strictly speaking is part of Armenia. The territory of the Diyār Bakr has, from the administrative point of view, generally followed the destiny of the *Ḍiazīra*. It has, however, sometimes formed, with neighbouring Armenia, a distinct and quasi-independent government. ʿIsā b. al-*Shaykh* al-*Shaybānī*, from 256/870 to 269/883, and his descendants ruled over the Diyār Bakr until the reconquest of Āmid by the caliph Muʿtaḍid in 286/899. The same situation occurred in Ḥamdānīd times when Diyār Bakr and Armenia were in the hands of the Amīr of Aleppo, Sayf al-Dawla, at the same time as northern Syria. After the death of the latter in 356/967 Diyār Bakr returned to the Ḥamdānīd Abū Taghlib of al-Mawṣil. With the rest of the *Ḍiazīra*, it fell under the domination of the Buwayhid ʿAḍud al-Dawla in 367/978, but after the death of the latter in 372/983 it passed into the hands of a Kurdish chief, Bādh (the Kurds were also inhabitants of this part of the *Ḍiazīra*), then to those of his nephew Abū ʿAlī b. Marwān, who disputed the Diyār Bakr lands with scions of the Ḥamdānīd family, but remained in control, and was the founder of the Marwānīd dynasty.

From Diyār Bakr comes the name of the Bakrī frontier posts (*al-thughūr al-bakriyya*) enumerated in M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des Ḥamdānīdes*, i, 254-61, and cf. 846 ff., which are situated in the north and north-west of the province.

ii. The formation of the Saldjūk empire faced the Marwānīds with a new problem. From the beginning they rejoiced in their increasing power, causing the *ḥuḥūba* to be read in the name of the Sultans as well as of the Caliphs. The Saldjūks were in no hurry to suppress a principality which was functioning as a buffer state between themselves and Byzantium. The Marwānīds, however, were unable to prevent some Turcoman infiltrations, some of which were accompanied by plunder. The collapse of the Byzantine power and the policy of the third Saldjūk, Malikshāh, which tended to reabsorb autonomous states, were in the long run a danger to the Marwānīds; the Banū *Ḍjahīr* [q.v.], originally from Diyār Bakr, whose resources they knew, were able to convince Malikshāh and Nizām al-Mulk [q.v.] of the interest of a conquest, which these latter entrusted to them; it was a bitter struggle, since the population was attached to a dynasty which guaranteed their autonomy, and took two years of campaigning (476-7/1084-5). Scarcely, however, had Diyār Bakr been thus directly annexed to the Saldjūk empire when the troubles which followed after the death of Malikshāh (485/1092) restored to them an autonomy of a different kind. A series of small Turcoman dynasties had set themselves up at Āmid (Inālids), Arzan, Isʿīd, etc., the most important of which was soon to become that of the Artūkids [q.v.] at Mārdīn, Ḥiṣn Kayfā, Mayyāfāriqīn and *Kharpūt*, and, after 578/1183, Āmid as well. It is true that this family was divided into two branches often at rivalry, and that it ran counter to the ambitions of the Saldjūks of Rūm, of the princes of

*Aḫlāt*, and especially the Zangid governors, then princes, of al-Mawṣil; nevertheless Diyār Bakr seems to have enjoyed in the 6th/12th century a relative material and cultural prosperity. More serious for the Artūkids was to be the ambition of the Ayyūbids [q.v.], who aimed, for reasons of military recruitment, at setting foot in this country which was in part peopled by their Kurdish congeners. After 580/1185 Ṣalāh al-Dīn occupied Mayyāfāriqīn, which afterwards fell to the lot of two successive sons of his brother al-ʿĀdil, then in 630/1233 to the son of the latter, al-Kāmil; the Saldjūks of Rūm, however, had occupied *Kharpūt*, and penetrated right into the heart of the Diyār Bakr country by the conquest of Āmid (638/1241). Diyār Bakr was thus politically divided when the Mongol invasion took place. In the face of this invasion, Artūkids and Ayyūbids had no differences, and both Mayyāfāriqīn and Mārdīn succumbed after severe sieges (657/1259 and 659/1261), but the Mongols allowed two small dynasties, an Artūkid one at Mārdīn and an Ayyūbid one at Ḥiṣn Kayfā, to remain, under their suzerainty; these recovered some degree of autonomy as the dislocation of the empire of the *Ilkhāns* proceeded. The region, however, became the prey of nomadic pastoral tribes, especially Kurds in the north and Turcomans in the south, whose attacks against the rural Christian communities of *Tūr ʿAbdīn* contributed to the Islamization of this region which had hitherto not proceeded very far. On the eve and the morrow of Timūr's devastations (especially at Mārdīn), Diyār Bakr was the stake in the struggles with which the two great confederations of the *Aḫ-Koyunlu* and the *Ḳara-Koyunlu* occupied themselves; the former, masters of Āmid, made themselves masters of the whole of Diyār Bakr having taken Mārdīn from the *Ḳara-Koyunlu*, and then Ḥiṣn Kayfā from the Ayyūbids. Diyār Bakr was, however, occupied for a time by the troops of *Shāh Ismāʿīl*, founder of the *Ṣafawī* dynasty in Persia (913/1507), and fell, for three centuries, into Ottoman hands in 922/1516.

It must be borne in mind that, in the terminology of the Saldjūks of Rūm, Diyār Bakr referred to the western confines of the province, which were all that they possessed, whereas in that of the Mongols it often refers to all the *Ḍiazīra*, including the Diyār Muḍar and the Diyār Rabīʿa.

iii. Diyār Bakr, in its Turkish form *Diyarbakır*, is the name by which the Turks called the capital of the province, Āmid, which they also called *Ḳara* ("black") Āmid, on account of the black colour of its ramparts and its houses, built of basalt (or mill-stone); this is noted by the Arab geographers, and is perhaps alluded to in a verse of al-Mutanabbī (ed. Barkūkī, i, 182; cf. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, ii/2, 316). A proverb relates that all there is black, dogs, walls, and hearts.

Only the Āmid of Arab times is described here. This was built on the left bank of the Tigris on a plateau which runs down abruptly to the river, which runs beside the enceinte on three sides, the fourth being protected by a moat and an outer wall.

Āmid was taken without a fight in 19/640 at the time of the conquest of the *Ḍiazīra* by ʿIyād b. *Ghanm*. It was besieged by al-Muʿtaḍid who put paid to the attempt at independence of the small *Shaybānī* dynasty (see above), and the walls of the town were dismantled; at the time of al-Muktadir, however, in 297/910, they were restored. An inscription commemorating this restoration is still legible on the Mārdīn gate. Āmid fell into the hands of the Buway-

hids in about 368/978. It was also the target of several attacks by the Byzantines, such as in 347 and 348/958 and 959 by the Domesticos John Tzimisce, and again when the same Tzimisce was emperor, in 972, 973 and 974 A.D. In the course of that of 973 the Domesticos Melias was taken prisoner. But the accounts of the historians of these sieges are often vague, contradictory and in part legendary. At all events, at the time when al-Mukaddasî was writing, in 375/985, Āmid, capital of Diyâr Bakr, had become a frontier post threatened in consequence of the success of the Byzantines, and Ibn Hāwkal seems to have foreseen that it would fall into Greek hands.

Āmid was renowned for its woollen and fine linen products, said to be "Greek" and "in the Sicilian style" (al-Mukaddasî, 145).

*Bibliography:* i. (to the 10th century): Le Strange, 109 ff., where reference to the geographers will be found; M. van Berchem, *Arabische Inschriften aus Armenien und Diyarbakr*, in *Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien zur ältesten Geschichte Armeniens und Mesopotamiens*, Abh. G. W. Gött., ix/3, 22; idem, *Inschriften Max Oppenheim*, i, *Arab. Inschr.*, 71, 91-2; M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, *Amida*; J. Strzygowski, *Kara-Amid*, in *Orientalisches Archiv*, i/5; Sarre and Herzfeld, *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet*, ii, 363; G. Bell, *Amurath to Amurath*, 322 ff.; J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam*, index; Amedroz, *The Marwanids*, in *JRAS*, 1903; M. Canard, *Hist. de la dynastie des Hāmdānides*, i, 77 ff., 572 ff., 795, 799, 838 ff. *et passim*; Margoliouth, *The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate*, index. On Amida in Roman times, see Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrat*, 323 ff.

ii. The sources are those of the history and general geography of the periods covered, for which see AḲ-ḲOYUNLU, ARTUKIDS, AYYŪBIDS; the only references specifically to Diyâr Bakr are Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriḳī (Marwānid part ed. B. A. L. Awad and M. S. Ghorbal, Cairo 1959; Artukid part analysed by Cl. Cahen in *JA*, 1935), and the anonymous Vienna ms. analysed by Cl. Cahen in *JA*, 1955; in Persian, the *Kitāb-i Diyārbakriyya* of Abū Bakr Tihirānī (ed. Faruk Sümer); in Syriac, the chronicle published by Ottomar Behnisch, *Rerum saeculo XV in Mesopotamia gestarum*, Bratislava 1838.—Modern works: Cl. Cahen, in *JA* 1935 and 1955; M. H. Yinanç and Faruk Sümer, in the articles *Diyarbakir*, *Akkoyunlu* and *Karakoyunlu* in *JA*. (M. CANARD and CL. CAHEN)

iv. Ottoman period. In 923/1527 the district of Diyâr Bakr was conquered by the Ottomans, who organized the newly conquered territories into an extensive province (*wilāyet*) centred on the city of Āmid, and including the districts of Diyâr Bakr, Maṣṣil, Diyâr Rabī'a and Diyâr Muḍar, as well as the territory of Bitlis (Bidlis). Later, at the time of Sultan Sulaymān the Magnificent, when 'Irāk was conquered, another *wilāyet* was formed at Ūrfa, while the territory of Bitlis was included in the *wilāyet* of Vān which had been formed in the territory of Aḳhlāt. The province of Diyâr Bakr remained, nevertheless, one of the largest and most important Ottoman provinces, and during four centuries of Ottoman government, protected from invasion and wars, it began to recover some of its prosperity. Its position near the Persian frontier gave it special importance. Its first *beylerbeyi* was Bilyıklī ("the mustachioed") Mehmed Paṣha, who had taken the city of Āmid from the Persians and was, therefore,

known as the Conqueror (Fātiḥ Paṣha). Other famous governors, who numbered Grand Viziers among them, included Khusrēw, Rustem, Iskender, Behrām, Özdemir (Oz-temür)-oğlu 'Oṭmān, Çiḡāla-zāde Sinān, Hāfīz Ahmed, Bosnalī Khusrēw, Ṭayyār Mehmed, Melek Ahmed, Kaplan Muṣṭafā, Dalṭaban Muṣṭafā, Köprülü-zāde 'Abd Allāh, Hekīm-oğlu 'Alī, Ḥasan, Reshīd Mehmed, Es'ad Muḫliṣ and Kurt Ismā'il Paṣhas. Both Bilyıklī Mehmed Paṣha and Özdemir-oğlu are buried within the enclosure of the Fātiḥ Paṣha mosque, founded by the former. Other *wālis* are also buried in the same mosque. Two inscriptions made in the name of Suleymān the Magnificent are in existence, an Arabic one in the court-yard of the Ulu(gh) Dījāmi' and a Persian one on the gate of the İç-Ḳal'ē (Inner Castle or Keep). A long decree (*fermān*) drawn up in Turkish in the name of Sultan Mehmed IV is engraved in the Dījāmi'-i Kebir (Great Mosque) (Basrı Konyar, *Diyarbakir tarihi*, ii, 130-3).

As the centre of an important province and the base and winter quarters of the armies against Persia, Āmid was also the headquarters of a *beylerbeyi* having a large number of troops under his command. Sultan Suleymān the Magnificent visited Āmid on 22 Rabi' II 942/20 October 1535, on his return from the Persian expedition, when he went up to the Castle, prayed in the Uluḡ Dījāmi' and spent some twenty days in the city, and also in 961/1554 when he stayed for eight days on his way out to the second Persian expedition. Sultan Murād IV visited Āmid in 1047-8/1638 on his way out to the Baghdād expedition and also on his return in 1049/1639 when he ordered the execution of the famous and very popular Shayḫ Maḥmūd Ūrmewī, known as the *shayḫ* of Rūmiyya.

Of the Ottoman *wālis* Khusrēw, Iskender, Behrām, Naṣūh, Murteḍā, Melek Ahmed, Dalṭaban 'Alī and Ismā'il Paṣhas built one mosque each in the city, while Ḥasan Paṣha had an inn (*khān*) built. Another *khān* is ascribed to Melek Ahmed Paṣha. Baths were built by Mehmed, Iskender and Behrām Paṣhas and a *dār al-ḥurra* by Köprülü-zāde 'Abdullāh Paṣha. Sarī (yellow or fair) 'Abd al-Raḥmān Paṣha founded a library. In 1815 Suleymān Paṣha repaired the walls.

Āmid, now known as Diyārbakr, also became an important cultural centre in Ottoman times. In the 10th/16th century it bred the poet Ibrahim Gulsheni, who also founded a *tariqa* (religious order), and the historian Kāḏī Huseyn. It was during that century that the famous historian Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Lāri was *mufti* of Āmid. Many poets are known as Āmidī in the 12th/18th century, including Labīb, Hāmi, Wālī and Ahmed Murshidī, as also the physician Ahmed Riḍā, the mathematician Ismā'il and the theologian Küçük Ahmed-zāde Abū Bakr. Later local notables included the poets Refī', Rāḡhib and Ṭālib in the 19th century, as also the historian, belletrist and poet Sa'īd Paṣha, while in modern times there are the latter's sons Suleymān Nazif and Fā'ik 'Alī Beys, 'Alī Emīrī Efendi, the founder of the *Millet* library, and the political thinker Ziya (Diyā) Gökalp. The 'Abd al-Dījalī-zāde family which gave many distinguished Paṣhas to the service of the Ottoman Empire is also of Diyārbakr origin. Descendants of tribal chiefs in the Kara-Ḳoyunlu and AḲ-Ḳoyunlu States, of 10th/16th century governors and of regional notables can still be found in the city.

In the second half of the 19th century the Diyārbakr region, like other Ottoman provinces, was the

scene of opposition and sometimes of revolts of local *amirs*, tribal chiefs and other notables who did not wish to accept the reforms carried out in the Ottoman Empire. This led to long drawn out punitive operations, as a result of which local chiefs, such as Bedr *Khān Pasha*, were forced to submit, or were punished, sometimes by exile. Leaders of nomadic or settled tribes, however, succeeded in maintaining their influence, even although their official titles had been abolished, only instead of gathering round *amirs* or tribal chiefs, these notables gave allegiance to the *shaykhs* of *derwish* orders (*ṭarīqa*). Led by *shaykh* Sa'īd, the latter rebelled in 1925 against the reforms which the new Republican government of Turkey sought to carry out. The revolt started in *Khani* and spread before long to most of the Diyārbakr region. The rebels were, however, beaten back before the walls of Diyārbakr, after which the Government, which had proclaimed a partial mobilization, rapidly quelled the rebellion. In 1928 an Inspectorate-General was formed in the regions of Diyārbakr and of *Akhlat* with the object of promoting reforms. While it was in existence a small rebellion was quelled at *Şaşūn*.

The city of Diyārbakr is always named *Āmid* in all writings up to the end of the 10th/16th century. It then began to acquire its present name, which was the name of the province of which it had become the centre, the name of *Āmid* being gradually forgotten. Under the Republic the form *Diyarbakır* was officially adopted, in place of the earlier *Diyarbakir*.

*Bibliography*: Among Ottoman geographers and travellers, *Kātib Çelebi* (*Diḥannumā*) gives some information, *Ewliyā Çelebi* very much more (*Siyāhatnāme*, iv, 24 ff.). There are useful data on the social and cultural conditions in the region of Diyārbakr in the *Menāḥib* of *Ibrāhīm Gūlshenī*. Interesting information on local customs is given in the chapter on Diyārbakr written by *Bakr Faydī* (in the author's private library). At the end of the 19th century *Diyārbekirli Sa'īd Pasha* gives the mediaeval Islamic history of the city in his *Mir'āt al-'ibar*: he does not, however, add very much to the data of *Ibn al-Athīr* and *Munedjīdim-Baḥrī*. Detailed information on local scholars and writers is given in 'Ali *Emīrī Efendi*, *Tadhkira-i shu'arā-i Āmid* (Istanbul, 1227). The second volume of this work has not, however, been printed. There is further information in the same writer's *Diyārbekir Vilāyeti*, Istanbul 1918, in his *Mir'āt al-fawā'id* and in the magazine *Āmid* which he published. For more recent Turkish work on the history of the city and province see *Basri Konyar*, *Diyarbakir tarihi, kitābeleri, yıllığı*, Ankara 1936; *Ibrahim Tokay*, *Diyarbakır*, Istanbul 1937; *Osman Eti*, *Diyarbakır*, *Diyarbakır* 1937; *Kadri Güntüt*, *Diyarbakır tarihi*, *Diyarbakır* n.d.; *Kāzım Baykal* and *Süleyman Savcı*, *Diyarbakır şehri*, *Diyarbakır* 1942. Much useful information will also be found in the *Sālnāmes* of Diyārbakr.

Data on the city and region can also be found in European travellers from the 16th century onwards. Scholars have also described the region and the archaeology, geography and history of the city. For local monuments and inscriptions see *van Berchem* and *Strzygowski*, *Amida* (Heidelberg 1910) (reviewed by *Khalil Edhem* in *TOEM* 1st year, no. 6, 1329, 365-77). Further information on inscriptions is given by *J. Sauvaget* and *Basri Konyar*. See also the extensive bibliography in *A. Gabriel*, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale* (Paris 1940). (MÜKRİMİN H. YINANÇ)

**Monuments.** One of the most remarkable characteristics of the present-day town of Diyārbakr is without doubt the archaeological wealth of this city of black stone, with its old quarters still surrounded by walls which give the site its character and which, throughout the middle ages, gave a strategic value to this locality which is otherwise lacking in natural protection. The well preserved enceinte naturally attracted the attention of 19th century European travellers, as well as admiration from all visitors to the stronghold since the Arab conquest (for example, the account of *Nāṣir-i Khusrāw*). But not until the serious archaeological investigation made on the spot by *A. Gabriel*, re-opening the joint study to which *M. van Berchem* and *J. Strzygowski* had formerly bent themselves on the basis solely of photographic material, was it possible to recognize in it one of the most eloquent witnesses of military art in the mediaeval Near East. The site shows a rampart of regular trace, somewhat modified by certain configurations in the terrain (the original town was in fact situated on the edge of a plateau bounded by escarpments on the side of the Tigris), displaying on a perimeter of more than 5 km. a curtain flanked by towers and contreforts, before which were a *fausse-braie* and a ditch, now filled in, interrupted by several monumental gates and by breaches of recent date. The layout of the curtain (8 to 12 m. high, 3 to 5 m. broad, built of masonry rubble between two matching facings), with its *chemin de ronde* protected by a crenellated parapet and its arched gallery running at certain places under the *chemin de ronde*,—the disposition of the square, polygonal or circular flanking towers, of varying dimensions, with powerful basalt piers equipped with lower casemates and with upper rooms or platforms arranged for defence,—the roman elements still in place between the circular salients of the gates now called the *Kharpūt*, *Urfa* and *Mārdīn* gates, all combine with epigraphic evidence to show the antiquity of an enceinte which indeed underwent successive alterations after the Arab conquest but "which remains the most important and the most complete example of Byzantine fortification of the 4th century" (*A. Gabriel*). No less significant, however, is the nature of the works which were carried out later,—on the one hand, during the 'Abbāsīd period, indicated particularly by the restoration of the principal gates (dismantled by *al-Mu'tadid*, then rebuilt by *al-Mu'tadid*, as inscriptions of 297/709 testify)—on the other, under the *Marwānids*, *Saldjūkīds* and *Artukīds* who undertook at different times partial repairs to the curtain and towers on the western front (indicated both by inscriptions and by underpinning of coursework), or more important works of reconstruction attested by those enormous circular bastions of the *Artukīd* period, *Ulu Badan* and *Yedi Kardash*, which are over 25 m. in diameter and encompass previous works within their complex systems of casemates and galleries—and, finally, under the Ottomans, who were content to keep the enceinte of the town in repair but directed their main efforts to the citadel, on the north-east corner of the rampart, extended it, and substituted their own works for the ruins of the former palace of the *Artukīds*.

In the interior of the enceinte the great mosque, *Ulu Djāmi'*, is noteworthy, whose abundant inscriptions, scattered in the greatest disorder on a heterogeneous composition in which re-utilized older material dominates, have provoked a clash of opinions concerning its origin and history. In fact

the most probable conclusions, with regard to both the actual state of the building and the vicissitudes (fire in particular) which, according to textual information, it must have undergone, tend to show it as a specifically Islamic construction, modified however continually under the different masters of the country "from Malik *Shāh* down to the Ottoman sultans of the 16th and 17th centuries". Mention must also be made of some Artukid *madrasas*, with a central court surrounded by porticos and with a great interior *iwān*, like the Mas'ūdiyya and Zindjiriyya *madrasas*, as well as the numerous Ottoman mosques, with a prayer-hall entered by a simple portico and covered by a cupola on a polygonal drum, which were built in the years after the capture of the town in 920/1514. Other interesting remains of this last period, marked for Diyārbakr by a real commercial prosperity, belong to the field of civil architecture, shown by the great caravanserais and spacious houses of an original type, built alike in fine ashlar.

The structural qualities of these various works should not let it be forgotten that there developed at Diyārbakr in the middle ages a school of very capable sculptors, who not only left some reliefs on their walls, not without artistic merit (Artukid reliefs often representing animal forms), but also brought a remarkable impetus to the particular style of decorative writing which then was most favoured for the exterior enrichment of monuments. The inscribed bandeaux of the 5th/11th century at Diyārbakr, which have already been the subject of intensive research by S. Flury (a real pioneer in this field), constitute the best examples of this ornamental epigraphy of Upper Mesopotamia the influence of which was to be felt in neighbouring lands and whose luxuriance, with its "incessant variations of detail brought to an initial type by an incomparable richness of invention" (J. Sauvaget, in *Ars Islamica*, 1938, 214), has been emphasized.

*Bibliography:* M. van Berchem, *Arabische Inschriften*, apud M. von Oppenheim, *Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien*, Leipzig 1909, 71-100 (nos. 114-25); M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, *Amida*, Heidelberg-Paris 1910; S. Flury, *Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr*, Basle-Paris 1920 (= *Bandeaux ornements à inscriptions arabes*, in *Syria*, 1920-1, 235-49, 318-28, 54-62); A. Gabriel, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, with a *Recueil d'inscriptions arabes* by J. Sauvaget, Paris 1940, 85-205, 310-38 (nos. 38-108). (J. SOURDEL-THOMINE)

**DIYĀR MUḌAR**, a name formed in the same way as Diyār Bakr [*q.v.*], is the province of the *Djazira* whose territory is watered by the Euphrates and its tributary the *Balikh* as well as by the lower reaches of the *Khābūr*. It extends on both banks of the Euphrates from Sumaysāt (Samosata) in the north to 'Anā ('Ānāt) in the south. The principal town of the Diyār Muḍar was al-Raḡga on the left bank of the Euphrates; other major towns were Ḥarrān on the *Balikh*, Edessa (al-Ruhā, Urfā), capital of Osrhoene, and Sarūdj to the south-west of Edessa. Those places situated on the Euphrates after its confluence with the *Balikh*, such as al-*Karkisiyā* and al-Raḡba, were sometimes united in a special district known as the "Euphrates Road".

For most of the time the Diyār Muḍar formed part of the government of the *Djazira*, but was sometimes separated from it. Such was the case in Ḥamdānid times when it formed part of the amirate

of Aleppo with Sayf al-Dawla. After him it reverted to the amirate of al-Mawṣil, and later fell into the power of the Buwayhids like the rest of the *Djazira*; then it became the capital of the small Numayrī dynasty (Banū Numayr), which was brought to an end by the Saljūks. On the other hand, the Diyār Muḍar was often overrun by the Byzantine armies in the 4th/10th century, and in the 5th/11th century the Byzantine empire succeeded in annexing Edessa and its district, in 423/1032.

*Bibliography:* Le Strange, 86 ff., 101 ff.; Cl. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, 110 ff.; Margoliouth, *The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate*, index; M. Canard, *Hist. de la dynastie des Ḥamdānides*, i, 86 ff., 795 ff., 838 ff., et *passim*; D. S. Rice, *Medieval Harran*, in *Anatolian Studies*, ii, (1952), 36-83. (M. CANARD)

ii.—After the Byzantine conquest of Edessa, the Diyār Muḍar, which continued to be a communication territory without real autonomy, was divided into two parts, one in the north under Christian domination, partially colonized by Armenians, the other in the south, with Ḥarrān as its principal centre, where the dominant influence was that of the Numayrī Arabs. From 457/1065, however, the country sustained the repercussions of Turkish expansion; it was troubled by marauding bands, and then at the beginning of 463/1071 it was crossed by the Saljūk sultan Alp Arslan who, on his way to Syria, at one point besieged Edessa, and in 471/1078 by Tutuṣh, brother of the new sultan Malikshāh. In the same year Ḥarrān and Sarūdj were incorporated, at the same time as Aleppo, in the principality of the 'Uḡaylid of al-Mawṣil, Muslim b. Kuraysh [*q.v.*], a nominal vassal of Malikshāh, and Edessa into the state of the Graeco-Armenian Philaretēs, master of the western Taurus and later of Antioch. Finally the two divisions of the Diyār Muḍar fell into the hands of Malikshāh himself, with al-Mawṣil and northern Syria, in 479/1086.

Nevertheless, Saljūk domination in this frontier region was fairly lax, and the disorders following the death of Malikshāh (485/1082) maintained at Edessa an Armenian rulership which was practically autonomous. The Crusade at the end of 1097 renewed for a half-century the partition commenced by the Byzantine conquest. Although the Franco-Armenian county of Edessa, as well as the lands to the south of the western Taurus along the middle Euphrates, formed its northern part, Ḥarrān, seat of an ephemeral Turkish principality at the beginning of the 6th/12th century, was cast with the lot of Aleppo between the hands of the Artukids and the Zangids. In 553/1158 Zangī granted it in fief to 'Alī Kūcūk, the holder of Irbil to the east of al-Mawṣil, in order to ensure the recruitment of the Turco-Kurdish contingents who were responsible for its defence, which was strategically important; his successors, the Begteginids [*q.v.*], held it for half a century. The 'Uḡaylid Arab seignory which held sway at Kal'at *Dja'bar* was suppressed by Nūr al-Dīn [*q.v.*] in 558/1163. Thanks to the disturbances which marked the succession of this prince, the Diyār Muḍar was occupied by Ṣalāh al-Dīn [*q.v.*], who granted it first to his nephew Taḡl al-Dīn 'Umar, then to his brother al-'Ādil. The latter, who had become master of the Ayyūbid heritage, assigned it to his son al-Aṣḥraf (597/1201), who in 624/1227 exchanged it for Damascus with his brother al-Kāmil of Egypt. Al-Kāmil incorporated it in the government set up in the east for the benefit of his son al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb who, threatened by the anti-Ayyūbid coalition